| | Case 2:21-cv-01022-WBS-GGH Docume | ent 8 Filed 08/02/21 | Page 1 of 2 |
|----|--|----------------------|-------------|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | ALAMIN SAMAD, | No. 2:21-cv-01022 | WBS GGH P |
| 12 | Petitioner, | | |
| 13 | v. | <u>ORDER</u> | |
| 14 | SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, | | |
| 15 | Respondent. | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | Petitioner has filed a motion for relief from judgment or order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. | | |
| 18 | 60(b). ECF No. 7. Under Rule 60(b), a party may seek relief from judgment or order in limited | | |
| 19 | circumstances such as mistake, newly discovered evidence, and fraud. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1)-(3). In | | |
| 20 | his motion, petitioner is seeking to "void" the undersigned's June 24, 2021 screening order of | | |
| 21 | petitioner's habeas petition. ECF No. 7. Petitioner alleges the June 24, 2021 order contained "factual | | |
| 22 | errors that are not support[ed] by the court records"; failed to review petitioner's motion for relief | | |
| 23 | from judgment (ECF No. 4) properly; and the fraud committed by the undersigned prevented | | |
| 24 | petitioner from presenting his case. ECF No. 7 at 1-3. | | |
| 25 | Petitioner is advised that no "final judgment" or "final order" has been entered on which a | | |
| 26 | Fed. R. Civ. P 60(b) motion could be based. On the contrary, petitioner may be construing the | | |
| 27 | undersigned's screening order and/or the denial of the original motion for relief from judgment as a | | |
| 28 | dismissal of the action. However, petitioner has been granted an opportunity to amend his habeas | | |

| 1 | petition to properly assert which conviction he is seeking to challenge, as well as to clearly state each | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | claim for relief. At present, the court cannot ascertain from petitioner's original petition whether | | |
| 3 | petitioner has properly brought a habeas action. | | |
| 4 | Petitioner also made an earlier Rule 60(b) motion alleging that the state court of conviction | | |
| 5 | did not have subject matter jurisdiction. ECF No. 4. This motion was filed prior to any screening | | |
| 6 | order of this court. Rule 60(b) motions may be directed only to final <i>federal court</i> judgments. State | | |
| 7 | court convictions are not subject to Rule 60(b) proceedings. The screening order denied the Rule | | |
| 8 | 60(b) motion. | | |
| 9 | Petitioner shall amend his federal petition for habeas corpus as ordered. | | |
| 10 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's motion for relief from judgment o | | |
| 11 | order (ECF No. 7) is denied as inapposite. | | |
| 12 | Dated: August 2, 2021 | | |
| 13 | <u>/s/ Gregory G. Hollows</u> UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |